

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **6 June 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1-2, 12-14, 21, and 23 were rejected under 102(b) as being unpatentable over DeBrosse et al (USPN 5,534,732 hereinafter, “DeBrosse”). Claims 3-8, 15-16, 18-19, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBrosse, in view of Keeth (USPN 6,043,562, hereinafter “Keeth”). Claim 20 was allowed. Claims 9-11 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over DeBrosse. Independent claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBrosse, in view of Keeth.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to include allowable limitations from claims 9 and 17, respectively. Dependent claims 2-6, 7-11, and 14-24 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 25-27, dependent upon claim 13, have been added to parallel the limitations of claims 7, 8, and 12.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 13 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 7-8 and 12, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 25-27, which depend upon claim 13, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 14 June 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com